

Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13 and 15-22 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 13, 15 and 19 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Along these lines, paragraph 0022 describes how the maintenance user is on-site and utilizes the information to locate said equipment, plant or process and to address the new event or alarm at the location of said equipment, plant or process. Additionally, paragraph 0028 describes configuring the software entity with an address of an internal user and an external expert.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,646,564 to Azleres et al.

Azleres et al. does not disclose the claimed invention since, among other things, Azleres et al. does not disclose a method to carry out at least one of retrieving or accessing information about an equipment, plant or process in a facility, where the method includes logging in to the control system by a maintenance user on site at the facility, retrieving by the control system information associated with the equipment, plant or process including the location in the facility of the equipment, plant or process, and utilizing by the maintenance user the information to locate said equipment, plant or process and to address the new event or alarm at the location of said equipment, plant or process. Rather, Azleres et al. discloses a system and method for

remote management of equipment operating parameters. As described at col. 1, lines 33-42, Azleres et al. is directed at food cooling systems where sites "can neither afford or justify having the required skilled technicians on site to diagnose and remedy equipment problems that may arise." Azleres et al. goes on at col. 1, line 65, through col. 2, line 1, to clearly describe how the "system allows one or more users to monitor the operation and performance of equipment located at multiple sites that can be geographically remote from the user.

Azleres et al. does not disclose configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the equipment, plant or process. Rather, as described at col. 6, lines 1-8, Azleres et al. discloses that, "The display of the personal computer 112 can be programmed to constantly display selectable readings from the sensors 102, thereby providing a constant, real-time display of the operating conditions and performance of the equipment 100." Azleres et al. does not appear to include any disclosure concerning the software architecture of the system. There mere act of programming a display to display certain readings is not equivalent to such configuring of a software entity.

Additionally, as recited in claim 1, for example, configuring the software entity can include links to information regarding all equipment, plant, and processes monitored and controlled by the control systems. As described in paragraph 0064, such information could include "manufacturers information, remotely stored information or external expert held information may also be retrieved by searching all records in a database of the control system for external technical information about a selected device A or a system B."

The information can include equipment operation logs, logged sensor data, maintenance records, stored manufacturer information, drawings. However, the claimed invention also configures the software entity with the address of internal and external experts. This provides direct links between the on-site maintenance user and the experts when necessary and/or desired, which is unknown in the art.

Azleres et al. does not disclose initiating action by notifying a maintenance user on site at a facility of an alarm or issue, for example, with equipment at the local facility, directing the maintenance user to the equipment and providing the maintenance user with information regarding the alarm or issue and how to resolve the alarm or issue. Azleres et al. discloses remote computer control. Additionally, Azleres et al. relies upon remote controlled cameras to view equipment, as described at col. 7, lines 1-5. The monitoring and control are directed from locations remote to the sites of the equipment rather than from at the site of the equipment. Azleres et al. does not disclose directly transmitting alarms to users on site and the users diagnosing problems and themselves seeking additional information from local or remote sources. While it appears as if Azleres et al. might disclose sending information to on-site personnel, this only occurs after directing alarm information to a call center, as disclosed at col. 11, lines 40-43. As stated in this passage, the field technician is not on-site. This is clear from the disclosure of Azleres et al., which emphasizes the lack of personnel on-site and the remote nature of the management.

In view of the above, Azleres et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22. Since Azleres et al. does not disclose all elements of

the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22, the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In view of the above, Azleres et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22. It follows that, Azleres et al. does not anticipate the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-19, 21 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the reference relied upon in the office action does not disclose patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the reference relied upon in the office action does not anticipated the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection based upon the cited reference.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and

issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2011

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300